

REMARKS

Claims 15-26 were presented and examined. In response to the Office Action, Claims 15, 19, and 23 are amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0001815 of Cui (“Cui”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0065472 of Eckel et al. (“Eckel”). We respectfully traverse this rejection.

While Applicant’s argument here is directed to the cited combination of references, it is necessary to first consider their individual teachings, in order to ascertain what combination (if any) could be made from them.

Regarding Claim 15, Claim 15 is amended to recite adapting visual data in response to received first display capability information of a first display device in a first user terminal and according to a usage environment of the first user terminal. Claim 15 also recites adapting the visual data in response to received second display capability information of a second display device in a second user terminal, and according to a usage environment of the second user terminal. Claim 15 is further amended to recite that the backlight luminance information from first and second display capability information is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments.

In contrast with Claim 15, paragraph [0021] of Cui discloses adjusting backlight brightness to satisfy computer system power consumption. That is, Cui adjusts backlight brightness based on the state of a computer. Cui, however, relates to adjusting backlight brightness, in a single device, by a computer that is in the same computing environment as the single device. Cui does not disclose or suggest outputting first adapted visual data to a first user terminal and outputting second adapted visual data to a second user terminal, wherein the first

and second display capability information are hierarchically structured, and backlight luminance is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments, as in Claim 15.

In contrast with Cui, the visual data adaptation method of Claim 15 recites display capability information that is structured in a specific way. Cui does not disclose *structured display capability information that includes backlight luminance information as a sub-element of the display capability information, and the backlight luminance information is described as a numerical value ranging from a lowest possible value to a highest possible value that is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments*, as in Claim 15.

Due to the hierarchical structure recited by Claim 15, the display capability information can be generalized and structured for application to various systems, and is easily extended to include other characteristic information necessary for the visual data adaptation to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments. Clearly, these advantages are not expected from the cited reference to Cui, or the references of record.

As correctly recognized by the Examiner, Cui does not expressly teach where the adapted visual data is outputted to a separate user terminal. As a result, the Examiner cites Eckel. We respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions and characterizations regarding Eckel.

Eckel relates to a device that has utility in environments found in offices, schools, homes, industrial plants, or any other type of automated facility in which sensors are utilized for energy monitoring control, user convenience, or HVAC control. (See page 2, paragraph [0020].) In contrast with Cui in view of Eckel, Claim 15 is amended to recite adapting visual data in response to received first display capability information of a first display device in a first user terminal and a usage environment of the first user terminal. As further recited by amended Claim 15, the same visual data is adapted in response to received second display capability information

of a second display device in a second user terminal and a usage environment of the second user terminal. Claim 15 further recites outputting first adapted visual to the second user terminal and outputting second adapted visual data to the second user terminal. As recited by Claim 15, the first and second display capability information are hierarchically structured to include backlight luminance information that is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments. Support for this amendment to Claim 15 is provided as page 2, paragraph [0018] of the published application.

We submit that it is improper for the Examiner to rely on the multiple sensor device of Eckel since it cannot be said that the energy monitoring and control device of Eckel discloses the output of first adapted visual data to a first user terminal and outputting second adapted visual data to a second user terminal wherein backlight information is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments. As result, the Examiner has failed to identify and we are unable discern any portion of Cui in view of Eckel that teaches or suggests first and second display capability information that are hierarchically structured to include backlight luminance information that is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments.

Therefore, no combination of Cui in view of Eckel teaches or suggests display capability information that is hierarchically structured to include backlight luminance information as a sub-element of the display capability information, and the backlight luminance information is described as a numerical value ranging from a lowest possible value to a highest possible value that is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source multi-use environment where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments, as in Claim 15.

For each of the above reasons, therefore, Claim 15 and all claims which depend from Claim 15 are patentable over Cui in view of Eckel. Each of Applicant's other independent

claims, including Claim 19, recite features similar to those discussed above. Therefore, all of Applicant's other independent claims, including Claim 19, and all claims which depend on them, are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 15-22.

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cui in view of Eckel as applied to Claims 15-22, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,943 of MacPhail ("MacPhail"). We respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding Claim 23, MacPhail, similar to Cui in view of Eckel, does not disclose first and second display capability information that are structured to include backlight luminance information as a sub-element of the display capability information, and the backlight luminance information is described as a numerical value ranging from a lowest possible value to a highest possible value that is adjusted according to different usage environments of the first and second user terminals to provide a single-source, multi-use environment, where one content is adapted to and used in different usage environments, as in Claim 23.

For each of the above reasons, therefore, Claim 23 and all claims which depend from Claim 23 are patentable over the cited art. We will request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 23-26.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 24, 2009

By: 

Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on August 24, 2009.



Si Vuong